



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

This commission is not proposed with reference merely to conditions that now exist, while the war goes on in Europe, but to such as may at any time prevail. Professor Taussig's proposal relates to a permanent tariff policy in this country, and it challenges the attention of our best statesmen, regardless of party affiliation.

Of course, I am not oblivious to some objections that will be made to this plan of creating a tariff commission, but I do not think of any objection that is insurmountable.

JOHN M. WHITEHEAD.

P. S. Since writing the above letter, my attention has been called to a kindred thought expressed in Congress by Mr. Hill of Connecticut, in a speech on House bill No. 702, relating to a protective tariff on dye stuffs.

JANESVILLE, WISCONSIN.

WANTED FOR MEXICO: "INTELLIGENCE AND FIRMNESS"

SIR,—The President is going to get our poor soldiers into a trap. You know it is almost impossible to get supplies to our men for more than a few hundred miles in the interior of that part of northern Mexico where Villa is now operating. Carranza won't let us use the railways, so what will our men do if President Wilson keeps up his do-as-little-as-possible plan?

He does not understand the Mexican character or he would not take such awful chances. Whatever he does is done on too small a scale. When our gunboats were at Vera Cruz it would have been a small task to repair railways and reach Mexico City. From there, as we got railways repaired, we could have taken all the other important points, meanwhile putting the Government on a sound financial basis. The capital is the strategic point for attack.

But it will be harder to fight in the mountainous districts than anywhere else. And we have selected one of them (Villa's home district, at that) to send a handful of soldiers into. It is criminal ignorance to proceed in this way. Grant that Carranza were truly loyal to the United States, he cannot prevent his troops from deserting to Villa. With Mexican armies on all sides and the water supplies (springs, lakes, rivers) poisoned, what can our soldiers do if they get far enough from the base of supplies?

It would not be such a task to subdue Mexico and set her on her feet again if we went at it right, but we are going at it all wrong. What good will it do merely to catch Villa? We have got to take hold of the financial end of that Government if we are ever to help the unfortunate masses who need help.

And until we help them back to permanent peace we cannot hope for relief from anarchistic conditions on our border. What else can the starving people of that hapless country be expected to do but murder and rob? We have got to help ourselves by helping them. Our interests are all bound up together. Just having different customs and different colors of skin and different names for our respective countries cannot prevent the great Law of Brotherhood instituted by God from continuing to rule us just the same. And according to that, if we would rise in the scale of civilization ourselves, we have got to help our fellow men to rise with us: both individuals and nations.

What we need is not "Preparedness" on a gigantic scale, but intelligent and firm use of the forces we already have. All our troops ought to be on the way to Mexico right now and the militia drilling. We shall gain nothing by delay. The Mexican masses are too ignorant to put faith in the United States until after we have controlled their country long enough for them to see that we meant to teach them how to govern it right when we took it over.

Oh, why can't some power bring Mr. Wilson to see the truth about the Mexican character! You cannot rely on them as we do on a white man's word of honor, because their natural instincts make treason the most natural thing on earth. From their point of view, how can a man be fool enough to place consideration higher than his immediate personal interest? Honor doesn't pay, in their estimation.

Please, please, try and help the Administration to bring common sense to bear on this international tangle! The wisest course is always the simplest, bravest, most direct course. Shall we make of this a short, decisive subduing of the lawless element in the entire Mexican nation, with several years of later assistance that will enable them to stand on their own feet; or shall we send our best men in by handfuls to catch a few individual bandits, and have American blood spilled to no purpose but to make ourselves a laughing-stock among nations? We can't help Mexico this way; we are only injuring ourselves.

Laura Althea Hill.

SAN MARCOS, TEXAS.

CAN WAGE-EARNERS SAVE?

SIR,—In an article, "Capitalism and Social Discontent," by J. Laurence Laughlin, in the March issue of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, the writer asks the question: "Then why is it that in the labor literature of our day, 'Capitalism' is used as a term of reproach or objugation?"

The answer from the viewpoint of Labor is that capitalism represents a condition of society under which the working classes function only as possessors of powers for the creation of returns upon capital possessed by the capitalist class. A pleasing conclusion reached by the writer was stated in the words: "Betterment cannot be permanently or even sensibly advanced so long as men are merely receivers of wages." But the suggested remedy of extending capitalism so as to give laborers, through their ownership of capital, some of the advantages of capital, is profoundly useless.

Before a wage worker can derive any income above his wages he must possess capital, and to obtain it he must save it out of his wages. Saving is an impossibility because the whole mechanism of the wages system so turns as to make wages equal only to the cost of subsistence. The writer agrees that so long as men are merely receivers of wages no sensible or permanent betterment can take place, but in spite of the conclusions expressed in this statement he proposes in another place that men lift themselves out of their positions by saving! The worker would hardly appreciate such an invitation to create something out of nothing.

It appears from the article itself that so far as economics is concerned, no hope can be held out for the wage worker as such. The writer passes to an entirely different field and speaks of individual qualities, such as